

From: Mike Nelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/10/01 10:50am
Subject: Legal Submission by interested party (a consumer)

To Whom It May Concern,

I have to admit, when I heard of the deal that the DOJ made with Microsoft, I had to hang my head in shame.

In a country that we depend on the government governed by the people, we the people were sold out to big business. I know this was a political decision, as our present President of the Country ran on the platform of being pro business. But one thing the people had to rely on in the past is the Justice Department keeping politicians in line with protecting the people of the United States from illegal business practices. You people wonder why America doesn't trust their government, this last DEAL you made with Microsoft just adds to the long list of reasons why we don't trust our government.

I am just a average person, I follow the laws in this country, and taught my children to follow the laws, and even taught them how to fight the laws within the system architecture to change unfair laws. But when they ask me now how to change the law within the boundaries of the law or fight an unfair law, how can I tell them when I can not tell them that our government is not looking out to protect the people? Microsoft has been found guilty in both the courts and appeal process on monopoly charges and practices.

Yet, your solution is to tell them fine, we will make a deal and you can continue your practice as if you did nothing, and you can continue to do these practices. I am amazed that you all can sleep at night. I know I would have problems.

All the consumer wants is choice. All we want is if laws are broken, then adequate punishment is applied so that those laws will be too costly to break again. Thank goodness that our State Attorney General is behind the idea of protecting the people that you were hired to do. The Federal Attorney's solution would actually spread the monopoly of microsoft into the schools and will reduce the competition so they can expand their monopoly practices. The time limits suggested is way to short. They should not be able to engage in any monopolistic practices for at least ten (10) years. In the past, I have put Netscape on my machines, and windows crashed, simply because Internet Explorer code was set up to not allow other competitive programs to share the same machine. If Microsoft wants to integrate their products into their platform, then they should provide in addition a platform that is basic and allows manufactures and people to add their own choices of programs. Any other solution is considered monopolistic.

In other words, I can buy a car with a radio, air conditioning, power brakes, etc. I do not have to buy one brand, even after the car is paid for. A standard is set that all of the electronic and hardware is interchangeable to the choice of the consumer, not the manufactures. A Ford or Chevy will take a third party radio for example if I want to change it, is my point.

I know this will never reach the judge, but at least I put in the consumers point of view.

Michael D. Nelson
2448 Rebecca Rd.
Manhattan, KS 66502
785 587-0664

CC: GENERAL@ksag.org@inetgw